being active, deleted (having no database data) or in some phase of deletion (e.g. delete pending, delete now, etc.). In the delete phases, the database data is not being updated or maintained. Norin does not teach or suggest a standby state configured to maintain the internal node database as a mirror copy of an external node database.

Regarding Claim 1, Norin does not teach or suggest a gateway configured to allow multiple nodes on a computer network to communicate using one or more data protocols, wherein the one or more data protocols are transmitted over a network medium using a medium protocol, the gateway further providing an application programming interface to communicate with the multiple nodes, the gateway including an internal node database comprising information about nodes on a network, and a software module configured to provide an active mode and a standby mode, the active mode configured to maintain the internal node database and to provide access to the node database, the standby mode configured to maintain the internal node database as a mirror copy of an external node database.

Regarding Claim 2 in combination with Claim 1, Norin does not teach or suggest that the internal node database includes rules that specify actions to be taken upon a state change of a client node.

Regarding Claim 3 in combination with Claim 2, Norin does not teach or suggest that the rules are simple rules.

Regarding Claim 4 in combination with Claim 2, Norin does not teach or suggest that the rules are complex rules.

Regarding Claim 5 in combination with Claim 2, Norin does not teach or suggest a rules engine configured to interpret the rules.

Regarding Claim 6 in combination with Claim 2, Norin does not teach or suggest shims configured to translate rules into a rule definition language.

Regarding Claim 7 in combination with Claim 2, Norin does not teach or suggest that the state change includes a change in an instance variable of the client node.

Regarding Claim 9 in combination with Claim 1, Norin does not teach or suggest that the software module is configured to transition to the active mode when an unacknowledged client request is detected.

Regarding Claim 10 in combination with Claim 1, Norin does not teach or suggest that the gateway is further configured to tunnel a first protocol through a second protocol.

Regarding Claim 13 in combination with Claim 7, Norin does not teach or suggest an event handler configured to notify a user application when a change occurs in an instance variable of the client node.

Regarding Claim 14 in combination with Claim 1, Norin does not teach or suggest an object-oriented application programming interface.

Regarding Claim 19, Norin does not teach or suggest creating a node database containing information about the nodes, designating an active gateway node to maintain the node database, the active gateway node providing one or more access methods to access the node database, and mirroring the node database in one or more standby server nodes.

Regarding Claim 20 in combination with Claim 19, Norin does not teach or suggest interpreting and executing rules that specify actions to be taken when a state change occurs in a client node.

Regarding Claim 21 in combination with Claim 20, Norin does not teach or suggest that the rules are interpreted by a rules engine.

Regarding Claim 22 in combination with Claim 20, Norin does not teach or suggest generating event notifications when the state change occurs.

Regarding Claim 23 in combination with Claim 22, Norin does not teach or suggest that the notifications are provided to a dispatcher.

Regarding Claim 24 in combination with Claim 20, Norin does not teach or suggest translating received data into a rule definition language.

Regarding Claim 25 in combination with Claim 20, Norin does not teach or suggest that the state change includes a change in an instance variable of the client node.

Regarding Claim 27 in combination with Claim 19, Norin does not teach or suggest activating one of the standby server nodes after the active server becomes inactive.

Regarding Claim 28 in combination with Claim 19, Norin does not teach or suggest encapsulating raw packets in a first protocol into wrapper packets in the desired protocol and tunneling the raw packets through the desired protocol.

Regarding Claim 31 in combination with Claim 19, Norin does not teach or suggest notifying a user application when a change occurs in an instance variable of the client node.

Accordingly, Applicants assert that Claims 1-7, 9, 10, 13, 14, 19-25, 27, 28 and 31 are allowable over the prior art, and Applicants request allowance of Claims 1-7, 9, 10, 13, 14, 19-25, 27, 28 and 31.

Rejection of Claims 8, 11, 12, 15, 26, 29, 30, 32 and 33 Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

The Examiner rejected Claims 8, 11, 12, 15, 26, 29, 30, 32 and 33 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Norin. Norin teaches a distributed database system, not a gateway configured to allow multiple nodes on a computer network to communicate using one or more protocols. In Norin, the data in the database is conventional database data (e.g., employee records, billing records, etc.) not information about the nodes. Norin does not teach or suggest an internal node database comprising information about nodes on a network. Moreover, Norin teaches database servers as being active, deleted (having no database data) or in some phase of deletion (e.g. delete pending, delete now, etc.). In the delete phases, the database data is not being updated or maintained. Norin does not teach or suggest a standby state configured to maintain the internal node database as a mirror copy of an external node database.

Regarding Claim 8 in combination with Claim 1, Norin does not teach or suggest that the internal node database is updated by issuing ping requests.

Regarding Claim 11 in combination with Claim 10, Norin does not teach or suggest that the medium is a power line and the medium protocol is a power line protocol.

Regarding Claim 12 in combination with Claim 1, Norin does not teach or suggest that the medium is a power line and the medium protocol is a PLX protocol.

Regarding Claim 15 in combination with Claim 14 Norin does not teach or suggest an internet browser configured to provide a user interface to information in the internal node database.

Regarding Claim 26 in combination with Claim 19, Norin does not teach or suggest issuing ping requests and listening for responses to the ping requests, the responses used to update the node database.

Regarding Claim 29 in combination with Claim 19, Norin does not teach or suggest that the medium is a power line and the medium protocol is a power line protocol.

Regarding Claim 30 in combination with Claim 19, Norin does not teach or suggest that the medium is a power line and the medium protocol is a PLX protocol.

Regarding Claim 32 in combination with Claim 19, Norin does not teach or suggest using an internet browser to view information in the node database.

Regarding Claim 33 in combination with Claim 19, Norin does not teach or suggest using an internet browser to control nodes on a power line network.

Accordingly, Applicants assert that Claims 8, 11, 12, 15, 26, 29, 30, 32 and 33 are allowable over the prior art, and Applicants request allowance of Claims 8, 11, 12, 15, 26, 29, 30, 32 and 33.

<u>Summary</u>

Applicants assert that Claims 1-16 and 19-33 are allowable over the prior art, and Applicants request allowance of Claims 1-16 and 19-33. If there are any remaining issues that can be resolved by a telephone conference, the Examiner is invited to call the undersigned attorney at (949) 721-6305.

Respectfully submitted,
KNOBBE, MARTENS, OLSON & BEAR, LLP

Dated: _Jan 29, 2023_ By: _____
Lee W. Henderson Ph.D.
Registration No. 41,830
Attorney of Record
Customer No. 20,995
(949) 760-0404

H:\DOCS\LWH\LWH-8565.DOC
012903